



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,553	06/20/2001	Lars-Peter Heineck	GR 98 P 1379 D	6319

7590

04/17/2003

LAURENCE A. GREENBERG
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022

EXAMINER

MONDT, JOHANNES P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2826

DATE MAILED: 04/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/885,553

Applicant(s)

HEINECK ET AL.

Examiner

Johannes P Mondt

Art Unit

2826

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2003 and 18 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/18/2003 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

Amendment B filed 02/20/2003 has been entered as Paper No. 9 following the receipt of the abovementioned Request for Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114. In Amendment B Applicant substantially amended claim 1 and thereby all outstanding claims 1 and 3-8. Comments on Remarks by Applicant in said Amendment B are included below under "Response to Arguments".

Response to Arguments

Remarks by Applicant have been fully considered. Although the rejections as made for claims 1 and 3-8 have to be amended in view of the amendment of claim 1 (and thereby of all outstanding claims), new art has come to light over which the further limitations are obvious, given the prior art cited in Paper No. 8. In particular, the

Art Unit: 2826

additional application of a silicon nitride side wall spacer on a silicon dioxide passivation layer disposed on the gate side walls for the purpose of preventing ions to migrate, is obvious over Joseph et al (5,907,777) (cf. title, abstract, column 4, lines 15-18 and column 5, lines 14-19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. ***Claims 1 and 3-6*** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun et al (5,612,249) in view of Joseph et al (5,907,777).

With regard to claim 1: Sun et al teach (cf. Figure 19 and column 8, lines 40-53) a MOS transistor that may be used as a single-transistor memory cell, comprising:

a semiconductor substrate 1 (cf. column 4, lines 50-52) having a substrate surface, a first conductive region and second conductive region (source and drain regions 24, see column 8, lines 48-52);

a gate oxide 5/14 (cf. column 5, lines 24-33 and column 7, lines 12-27; note that the material constitution of regions 5 and 14 are prescribed in identical manner: both regions are to be made by oxidation of silicon; hence from the device point of view the regions 5 and 14 constitute a contiguous entity) disposed on said substrate surface;

Art Unit: 2826

a gate 6/18 (cf. column 5, lines 34-37 and column 7, lines 65-67: note that regions 6 and 18 both materially are defined in exactly the same manner: they should consist of either poly or amorphous silicon; the distinction between gate 6 and interconnect 18 is thus from a device point of view moot, as both regions are materially identically specified and are, as gate and gate interconnect, required to have the same electrically conductive requirements) disposed on said gate oxide over an area between said first and second conductive regions (cf. Figure 19) and having at least one side wall (namely its interface with region 23), said sidewall being adjacent at least one of said conductive regions 24 (i.e., said sidewall between regions 5 and 23 is adjacent to region 24;

an oxide passivation layer 23 (cf. column 8, lines 40-42) disposed on said side wall of said gate;

said gate oxide insulating said gate (note that the material constitution of the gate oxide is prescribed as the product of the oxidation of silicon, hence silicon oxide; see column 5, line 27; and column 7, lines 12-15) and having a thickened area below said side wall 23 of said gate.

Sun et al do not necessarily teach the further limitations that (a) specifically said oxide passivation layer is a silicon dioxide passivation layer, and that (b) an insulating silicon nitride spacer be disposed on said oxide passivation layer, said (insulating silicon nitride) spacer acting as oxidation barrier.

However, ad (a): Sun et al do advocate thermal oxidation of silicon to be a viable method to produce thin SiO₂ films that can be used in conjunction with thermal

Art Unit: 2826

nitridation of silicon (silicon nitride films) to create easily controllable, effective barriers (cf. column 2, lines 2-9); the selection of *silicon* oxide is thus an obvious one within the context of the patent to Sun et al; *furthermore, ad (b)*: as shown by Joseph et al (cf. Figure 7, column 4, lines 15-22 and column 5, lines 8-19), it has long been known in the art of insulated gate field effect transistors that it is advantageous to apply an additional silicon nitride layer (cf. column 4, line 16) over a silicon (di)oxide passivation layer 302 (cf. column 5, line 29) protecting the sidewall of an insulated gate, for the specific purpose of preventing the migration or diffusion of ions (cf. column 5, lines 15-16).

Motivation to include the teaching in this regard by Joseph et al is the prevention of the deterioration of the insulating quality of the gate oxide; *combination* of said teaching with the invention by Sun et al is straightforward, as it only requires the retention of an intermediate structure, as exemplified by Figure 15 in Sun et al (particularly, layers 11 and 13). *Success* in implementing said teaching can thus be reasonably expected.

Finally, the (insulating silicon nitride) spacer inherently acts like an oxidation barrier to the same extent as it does in Applicant's specification, given the same topographic conditions in its surroundings, while the structure defines how it can act, and hence the structure is not additionally defined by line 14 of claim 1 ("...acting as an oxidation barrier").

With regard to claim 3: said gate taught by Sun et al is specifically allowed to be include a layer of polysilicon (cf. column 5, lines 34-37 and column 7, lines 65-67).

Art Unit: 2826

Therefore, the further limitation as defined in claim 3 does not distinguish over the prior art.

With regard to claim 4: Sun et al teach a layer of tungsten-silicide film 20 deposited on the polysilicon gate layer 18 (see Figure 17 and column 8, lines 13-18). Therefore, the primary reference teaches the further limitations defined by claim 4.

With regard to claim 5: said gate taught by Sun et al is specifically allowed to be include a layer of polysilicon (cf. column 5, lines 34-37 and column 7, lines 65-67).

With regard to claim 6: said gate taught by Sun et al is specifically allowed to include a tungsten silicide layer (column 8, lines 13-18 and Figure 17) and a polysilicon layer (cf. column 5, lines 34-37 and column 7, lines 65-67).

2. **Claims 7-8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun et al and Joseph as applied to claims 6 and 1, respectively above, and further in view of Krautschneider ((5,854,500). As detailed above, claims 1 and 6 are unpatentable over Sun et al, in view of Joseph et al. Sun et al nor Joseph et al necessarily teach the further limitation of claims 7 or 8. As shown by Krautschneider (front figure), however, lateral MOS transistors with attributes as essentially taught by the combination of the inventions of Sun et al and Joseph et al, particularly with gate oxide 110 (see in Krautschneider column 5, lines 17-26 and column 6, lines 26-27) and nitride side spacers 114 (cf. column 6, lines 45-49), and with a gate of polysilicon (cf. column 5, lines 19-20), for instance, have long been applied as selection transistors to DRAM

Art Unit: 2826

memory cells (cf. abstract, first sentence), thus constituting an obvious use of said combinations of inventions.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johannes P Mondt whose telephone number is 703-306-0531. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 18:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J Flynn can be reached on 703-308-6601. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

JPM
April 15, 2003



NATHAN J. FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800